STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

A STRATEGIC LEVEL CENTER OF GRAVITY ANALYSIS ON THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES REILLY
United States Marine Corps

USAWC CLASS OF 2002

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

20020520 086

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

A STRATEGIC LEVEL CENTER OF GRAVITY ANALYSIS
ON THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

by

Lieutenant Colonel James Reilly
United States Marine Corps

Colonel Jef Troxell
Project Advisor

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel James E. Reilly

TITLE: A STRATEGIC LEVEL CENTER OF GRAVITY ANALYSIS ON THE GLOBAL
            WAR ON TERRORISM

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 09 April 2002   PAGES: 55   CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The key to any successful strategic campaign begins with an analysis of both the friendly and threat strategic center of gravity. This analysis drives the development of the campaign plan by familiarizing planners with an understanding of how both belligerents organize, fight, and make decisions. Consequently, the improper identification or miscalculation of the center of gravity will lead to the misapplication of the elements of national power and ultimately to a campaign plan that will not meet the stated strategic objectives.

It is probably safe to assume that Carl von Clausewitz never envisioned fighting an enemy the likes of al Qaeda when he was developing his theories on the center of gravity and critical vulnerabilities. However, to say that this process does not apply to the current global war on terrorism is to ignore a very valuable analytical tool. In fact, Carl von Clausewitz was less concerned with establishing a formal system or set doctrine than he was in trying to achieve a general understanding of the complexities of war. In that light, this author believes that the center of gravity analysis does have a role in this war, if only to familiarize oneself with the capabilities and limitations of both belligerents.

While Joint and service doctrine/manuals generally agree on a common definition of center of gravity, considerable discrepancies still exist regarding the specific nature of center of gravity and its relationship to critical vulnerabilities. Dr. Joe Strange, a professor at the Marine Corps University, makes a recommendation for defining this relationship. He has developed a model that bridges the gap between the center of gravity and critical vulnerabilities by identifying critical capabilities and critical requirements. Dr. Strange posits that it is necessary to understand the center of gravity, critical capability, critical requirement, and critical vulnerability relationship in order to grasp fully the environment in which this campaign will take place. This model will be used for this analysis.

The purpose of this paper is three-fold: first, to determine a workable definition of terrorism and how this definition applies to the new religiously based terrorism the world witnessed on 11 September; second, to conduct a comprehensive strategic level center of gravity analysis that will identify the relative strength and weaknesses of the U.S. led coalition and the al Qaeda terrorist network and; third, to present potential friendly and enemy response strategies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The difficulty with conducting an analysis of this nature is that it is only as current as the day it was written. Depending on the successes or set-backs of the campaign the center of gravity, and/or its component parts, may change, increase or decrease in importance, or shift between the strategic, operational, and tactical levels. For example, a strategic critical capability may be an operational level center of gravity for a specific phase in the overall campaign. Once that phase is complete, and operations shift from one geographic area to another or from one functional area to another, then the center of gravity for that specific operation may change as well. Furthermore, once al Qaeda has been neutralized, or destroyed, and attention shifts to similar organizations with global capabilities, then the enemy strategic center of gravity may consequently change. Regardless, what will not change is the process and the importance this process has in determining a strategic direction. It is not so much in identifying a silver bullet for success as it is in understanding and appreciating all the factors that can influence operations.

It is also recognized that the global war on terrorism will need to address other organizations of global reach such as those associated with Narco-Terrorism, Eco-Terrorism, and those organizations located outside the Middle East. However, by analyzing al Qaeda and fully addressing the characteristics, strengths, and weaknesses of that terrorist network, this analysis may help to determine the strategic direction needed to deal with the remaining terrorist organizations of global reach. Therefore, this author has intentionally focused on al Qaeda not only because it represents the greatest threat to global stability but also because this network transcends the breadth of world terrorist organizations.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that a strategy that does not consider the root causes for terrorism is a strategy that will ultimately fail. Eliminating the rat without eliminating the environment in which the rat flourishes will only lead to another infestation of rats. Terrorism, as a strategy of choice, goes much deeper than the goals professed by al Qaeda. In fact, it can be argued that if you remove the grievances, poverty, injustices, inequality, and political persecution and alienation prevalent in the regions where terrorism flourishes, then terror as a strategy of choice will cease. Although this paper addresses, in general terms, some of these root causes, it does not address them in the detail necessary to fully understand and appreciate the underlying reasons why terrorist tactics are so prevalent, especially in the Middle East and South/Central America. In fact, a study of terrorism's root causes is so important that it is a separate research project in itself.

vii

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

x

LIST OF TABLES

A STRATEGIC LEVEL CENTER OF GRAVITY ANALYSIS ON THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

> "One must keep the dominant characteristics of both belligerents in mind. Out of these characteristics a certain center of gravity develops, the hub of all power and movement, on which everything depends. That is the point against which all our energies should be directed."
>
> —Carl von Clausewitz, On War

The strategic level attack of 11 September 2001 on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon was a well-planned, nearly flawlessly executed asymmetric attack that achieved a psychological impact unparalleled in U.S. history. The United States Government determined that the organization responsible for this attack was the al Qaeda Terrorist Network. This organization represents a new terrorism that is no longer linked to the political objectives of a single state or tied to sociological objectives, but one that is bent more on the physical and psychological destructive nature of their actions. In fact, this new terrorism regards large-scale violence not only as morally justified but also as a necessary expedient for the attainment of their goals.[1]

President George W. Bush stated in his 20 September 2001 address to a joint session of Congress and the American people, that this war on terrorism "will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated." It is a noble objective of unforeseen ramifications that will test the will and resolve of the United States and the international community. It will entail a commitment not seen since World War II, requiring a comprehensive strategic campaign that capitalizes on every aspect of the nation's elements of national power. In fact, this war wil be unlike anything the United States has fought in the past. It will necessitate a unique approach, with concurrent and multiple objectives, transcending the breadth of symmetric and asymmetric applications.

The key to any successful strategic campaign begins with the accurate assessment and selection of both the friendly and enemy strategic center of gravity. Central to this assessment is the requirement to know and understand how both belligerents organize, fight, and make decisions. Conversely, the improper identification or miscalculation of the center of gravity will lead to the misapplication of the elements of national power and ultimately to a campaign plan that will not meet the stated strategic objectives. The uniqueness of the global war on terrorism makes this analysis all the more important.

There are a number of differing interpretations as to what Carl von Clausewitz meant by Center of Gravity and Critical Vulnerability and how they relate to each other. Compounding this confusion is the fact that Joint and Service doctrine interpret the meaning and application of

Center of Gravity/Critical Vulnerability differently. For this analysis, this author will use a method proffered by Dr. Joe Strange of the Marine Corps University that bridges the gap between the center of gravity and critical vulnerabilities through the identification of critical capabilities and critical requirements. It is the understanding of this relationship that is central to fully grasping the environment in which the global war on terrorism will take place.

The purpose of this paper is three-fold: first, to determine a workable definition of terrorism and how this definition applies to the new religiously based terrorism the world witnessed on 11 September; second, to conduct a comprehensive strategic level center of gravity analysis that will identify the relative strength and weaknesses of the U.S. led coalition and al Qaeda terrorist network and; third, to present potential friendly and enemy response strategies. There are more terrorist organizations of global reach than al Qaeda, and the global war on terrorism will need to address all these organizations at some time in the future. However, this paper will nonetheless focus its enemy analysis on al Qaeda because it not only is responsible for the 11 September attack, but this author also believes that it continues to represent the greatest threat to global stability.

DEFINING TERRORISM

Before an effective analysis can be conducted, one must first define what terrorism is and, more specifically, what terrorism of global reach entails. This is a difficult task considering that there is no universally accepted or agreed definition for terrorism. There is difficulty reaching a consensus because the meaning and usage of the term has changed over time to accommodate the changes in the geo-political environment in which terrorism exists.[2] If terrorism is not adequately defined then it will be increasingly difficult to effectively distinguish it from other types of violence. For instance, whether the act is designated as an 'act of war' or whether its designated as a 'criminal act' may depend on what definition is adopted.[3] This has ramifications when developing the nation's strategic response to fighting terrorism of global reach.

Within the different departments and agencies of the U.S. Government there is no agreed upon definition of terrorism. In fact, each department's or agency's definition reflects the priorities and particular interests of that specific department or agency. For example, the U.S. Department of State uses the definition of terrorism contained in Title 22 of the United States Code, Section 2656f(d):

> Premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience.[4]

While the Federal Bureau of Investigation defines terrorism as:

> The unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a Government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.[5]

Moreover, the U.S. Department of Defense defines it as:

> The calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological.[6]

Furthermore, international organizations cannot agree on a definition because they cannot come to a consensus that addresses the concerns, and perspectives, from each of the participating parties. Additionally, experts and other scholars in the field are equally incapable of reaching a consensus. For example, Alex Schmid and Walter Laqueur, both esteemed experts in the field, acknowledge that it is neither possible to attempt to define terrorism nor worthwhile to make the attempt. In fact, a survey conducted by Alex Schmid identified twenty-two different word categories occurring in the 109 different definitions.[7] Walter Laqueur further states that defining terrorism is difficult because the character of terrorism has changed greatly over the last century, terrorism is not an ideology but an insurrectional strategy that can be used by people of very different political convictions and, there is not one specific kind of terrorism but many that do not fit preconceived notions.[8]

Terrorism is a pejorative term "with intrinsically negative connotations that is generally applied to one's enemies and opponents, or to those with whom one disagrees and would otherwise prefer to ignore."[9] "What is called terrorism," Brian Jenkins has written, "thus seems to depend on one's point of view. Use of the term implies a moral judgment; and if one party can successfully attach the label 'terrorist' to its opponent, then it has indirectly persuaded others to adopt its moral viewpoint."[10] This perception is also evident in the United Nations where the positions of Third World delegates, who identified with the perpetrator,[11] led to a definitional paralysis, and in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, where the identification was with the victim,[12] led to the definition of terrorism as the act itself.

Defining terrorism by the act itself closely resembles the approach followed by the majority of the international community. A Rand Corporation study in 1972 concluded that an act of terrorism was first a crime in the classic sense, such as murder or kidnapping, albeit for political motives. Accordingly, in separating terrorist tactics from their political context, it is easier to criminalize the act rather than accept the act as a certain form of political expression or warfare. Furthermore, even if it was accepted that the terrorists were waging war and were therefore

soldiers – that is, privileged combatants in the strict legal sense – terrorist tactics, in most cases, violate the rules that govern armed conflict, for example, the deliberate targeting of noncombatants or actions against hostages.[13] Unable to agree upon a universal definition of terrorism, nation-states have nonetheless been able to reach a consensus in outlawing and universally condemning specific acts of terrorism, such as airline hijacking and aircraft sabotage attacks on diplomats, or the taking of hostages.[14]

Terrorists, on the other hand, see themselves as bona fide freedom fighters that are entitled to be treated as a prisoner of war if captured and therefore, should not be prosecuted as common criminals in ordinary courts of law. They see themselves as fundamentally an *altruist* in that they believe they are serving a good cause "designed to achieve a greater good for a wider constituency – whether real or imagined – which they and their organization purport to represent."[15] Terrorists further argue that because of their numerical inferiority, far more limited firepower, and paucity of resources compared with an established nation-state's massive defense and national security apparatus, they have no choice but to operate clandestinely to carry out dramatic acts of hit and run violence in order to attract attention to, and ensure publicity for, themselves and their cause.[16]

Nevertheless, even in war, there are rules and accepted norms of behavior that prohibit the use of certain types of weapons, proscribe various tactics, and outlaw attacks on specific categories of targets.[17] In fact, one of the fundamental *raisons d' etre* of international terrorism is a refusal to be bound by such rules of warfare and codes of conduct.[18] And as any cursory look over the past twenty-five years of terrorist tactics and targets will demonstrate, terrorists have violated these rules with impunity and complete disregard for the basic moral and social norms established by the international community.

Another approach to defining terrorism is not to focus so much on the definitional elements but to differentiate it from other types of violence and identify some of the characteristics that make terrorism the distinct phenomenon of political violence that it is. Bruce Hoffman does this by distinguishing a terrorist from that of a guerilla and a common criminal. Treating guerilla warfare as synonymous with terrorism, he argues, is not surprising, but there are fundamental differences between the two. 'Guerilla', for example, in its most widely accepted usage, is taken to refer to a numerically larger group of armed individuals, who operate as a military unit, attack enemy military forces, and seize and hold territory (even if only ephemerally during daylight hours), while also exercising some form of sovereignty or control over a defined geographical area and its population.[19] Terrorists, on the other hand, do not operate in this manner. Furthermore, whereas criminals act primarily for selfish, personal

4

motivations and are not concerned with influencing or affecting public opinion through their violent acts, the fundamental aim of the terrorist's violence is ultimately to change the system – about which the ordinary criminal could care less. [20]

From this discussion, it is clear that while terrorism is not wholly a phenomenon of war, it is also not strictly a criminal act. According to Hoffman, by recognizing that terrorism is distinguishable from other forms of violence, it becomes easier to identify, in simple terms, what terrorism is:

- Ineluctably political in aims and motives;

- Violent – or, equally important, threatens violence;

- Designed to have far-reaching psychological repercussions beyond the immediate victim or target;

- Conducted by an organization with an identifiable chain of command or conspiratorial cell structure (whose members wear no uniform or identifying insignia); and

- Perpetrated by a subnational group or non-state entity[21]

This discussion demonstrates that defining terrorism is not easy. Terrorism involves more than the terrorist act itself, yet terrorism is ineluctably linked to that act. Moreover, terrorism is a profoundly psychological act and is, therefore, far more than a resort to violence.[22] The key question now is whether al Qaeda fits the characterizations discussed above or whether it belongs in a separate and distinct category. The answer may have ramifications on the selected strategy.

THE NEW TERRORISM

The type of terrorist attack the United States and the world witnessed on 11 September 2001 is representative of a relatively new, religiously motivated terrorism, unconstrained by limits on violence, that has moved towards a global perspective, specifically against secular heretic regimes.[23] This type of terrorism, represented most notably by al Qaeda, sees itself not as a component of an existing system worth preserving, but as an outsider seeking fundamental changes in the existing order. In fact, these terrorists see themselves engaged in total war, where they seek to appeal to no other constituency than themselves. For them,

> Violence is first and foremost a sacramental act or divine duty executed in direct response to some theological demand or imperative. Terrorism thus assumes a transcendental dimension, and its perpetrators are consequently unconstrained by the political, moral, or practical constraints that may affect other terrorists.[24]

5

Christopher Harmon, in his oral testimony of 20 September 2001 to the House Committee on Government Reform, describes this new terrorism as follows:

> ...wide in its appeal and global in its operations and aspirations. It seems feverish in its faith. It is profoundly angry at its enemies— whose numbers are long; the enemy's list may not begin with Americans, and it certainly includes many moderate Arab regimes. The international seems versed in ideology— not mere momentary heat or inspiration. It is so combative that some within it defy all sense of self-preservation. It is often well-educated, well-trained, well-financed, and well-armed. Most disturbingly, it is on the move. It appears to have very high morale, if very twisted morals. It seems to sense that its time has come, that its opportunities have never been better.[25]

It would be a mistake to write off their actions as mindless, irrational, and without purpose. To do so would be to ignore potential opportunities to identify weaknesses and to develop strategies to counter their actions. In fact, terrorist acts are planned, calculated, and systematic acts aimed at achieving a goal; however farfetched that goal may seem to the outsider. Regardless of their modus of operation, it is dangerous to view them only as madmen bent on complete annihilation. To them, terrorism is about power and also about the use of violence – or, equally important, the threat of violence –used and directed to achieve that power, whether it is political, sociological, or religious.

Terrorism discussed in the previous section and the terrorism practiced by al Qaeda is both similar and, at the same time, fundamentally different. They are similar in a general definitional or characteristic context, but they are different in the scope of and purpose for the action. Consequently, while al Qaeda is unique, a strategy can be developed that takes into account the violent and unconstrained nature of this network, the unquestionable criminal nature of their acts, and yet still addresses the underlying, or root causes.

METHODOLOGY FOR THE CENTER OF GRAVITY ANALYSIS

WHAT IS A CENTER OF GRAVITY?

Carl von Clausewitz introduced the concept of a center of gravity in his classic work On War in 1832. In this work, Clausewitz defined the center of gravity as the "hub of all power and movement, on which everything depends...the point which all our energies should be directed."[26] It is clear from his work that Clausewitz viewed centers of gravity as sources of moral and physical strength, power, and resistance. In fact, these sources can be intangible factors (such as resolve or morale); they can be capabilities or key localities;[27] or they can be relationships (like alliances or leadership).[28] More importantly, centers of gravity are not critical vulnerabilities.[29]

6

The center of gravity analysis concept is useful as a systematic tool to assist commanders and staffs in analyzing friendly and threat sources of strength as well as weaknesses and vulnerabilities. Center of gravity determination, if properly conducted, serves two principal purposes:

- It forces an up front assessment of what ultimately must be done to achieve aims and, consequently, forces an assessment of whether interests are important enough to justify the associated costs and risks.

- It is the foundation and provides the focus for campaign planning. It does not – and is not supposed to - explicitly tell how to conduct the campaign.[30]

While the concept of center of gravity analysis is valid, it must be used with caution. The analysis of centers of gravity and accompanying critical vulnerabilities can degenerate into a search for a 'silver bullet', a way to find some magic pressure point that can be surgically attacked by avoiding the belligerent's strength, in order to bring down the whole structure. The reality is that most belligerents, especially terrorist networks, have complex systems and do not always lend themselves to logical cause and effect linkages that normally form the basis for center of gravity and critical vulnerability analysis.[31]

Each combatant has a unique center of gravity at the strategic level of war, providing the critical link among the strategic, operational, and tactical level of war. In this respect, a strategic center of gravity is a significant entity that is necessary to carry on the fight. The center of gravity is the dynamic agent of action or influence from which all acts revolve and all strength resides. Examples at the strategic level can be national leaders, a strong-willed national population (the people), a military service or component thereof, strong financial resources, or a critical manufacturing resource.[32] To correctly identify the strategic center of gravity from a list of candidates, Major Phillip Giles and Captain Thomas Galvin, in their monograph Center of Gravity: Determination, Analysis, and Application, pose this question, that if answered in the affirmative, will determine the strategic center of gravity:

> Can imposing your will (destroy, defeat, delay) on the potential center of gravity candidate create the deteriorating effect that prevents your foe from achieving his aims and allows the achievement of ours...and will it be decisive?[33]

The global terrorist threat challenges conventional approaches to analyzing and identifying centers of gravity and critical vulnerabilities. For example, the decentralized nature and adaptive qualities of the terrorist network that allow it to quickly reconfigure its connections both internally and across a range of external support will make it difficult to identify enduring operational and tactical centers of gravity. Additionally, the capabilities and requirements

associated with the strategic level center of gravity and identified early in the campaign may be temporary and only transitory in their importance.[34] This will require a continuous, more flexible, and responsive process than normal because there may be a number of strategic capabilities and requirements, without readily apparent vulnerabilities, that reveal themselves as this war continues. Most importantly, it will require that planners remain ahead of the changes and 'get it right' when it comes to this analysis.

THE DR. JOE STRANGE MODEL OF ANALYSIS

Building upon the traditional Clausewitzian concept of centers of gravity, Dr. Joe Strange clarifies the concept and relationship between centers of gravity and critical vulnerabilities in his monograph entitled Centers of Gravity & Critical Vulnerabilities: Building on the Clausewitzian Foundation So That We Can Speak the Same Language.[35] He introduces two new conceptual terms, 'critical capabilities' and 'critical requirements.' These new terms bridge the gap and explain the relationship between centers of gravity and critical

*Center of Gravity: Primary sources of moral or physical strength, power and resistance.

*Critical Capabilities: Primary abilities which merits a Center of Gravity to be identified as such in the context of a given scenario, situation or mission.

*Critical Requirements: Essential conditions, resources and means for a Critical Capability to be fully operative.

*Critical Vulnerabilities: Critical Requirements or components thereof which are deficient, or vulnerable to neutralization, interdiction or attack (moral/physical harm) in a manner achieving decisive results.

FIGURE 1: CG-CC-CR-CV CONCEPT

vulnerabilities (Figure 1).[36] Understanding the relationship among centers of gravity, critical capabilities, and critical vulnerabilities (i.e. vulnerable critical requirements), is a necessary analytical process to fully understanding the environment in which we may be acting.[37]

Dr. Strange explains that critical capabilities are the inherent abilities that enable a center of gravity to function as such. The essential conditions, resources and means to make critical capabilities operative are what Dr. Strange calls critical requirements. Critical requirements are examined to discover critical vulnerabilities – actual or potential – that can be exploited to undermine, neutralize and/or defeat the center of gravity. Within the context of pitting friendly strengths against enemy weaknesses, commanders will understandably want to focus their efforts against those objects that will do the most decisive damage to the enemy's ability to resist.

Identification of friendly and threat center of gravity and critical vulnerabilities requires knowledge and understanding of how both belligerents organize, fight, make decisions, and what encompasses their psychological strengths and weaknesses.[38] Once identified, all aspects of military, economic, diplomatic, informational, and political strengths are applied against the center of gravity – either directly or indirectly. Frequently, the best means to weaken and/or neutralize a center of gravity is to exploit one or more critical vulnerabilities. In order to deliver a decisive blow against a center of gravity, it is important to strike at objectives affecting the center of gravity that are both critical to the belligerent's ability to fight and vulnerable to continued offensive actions.

THREAT CENTER OF GRAVITY ANALYSIS

CENTER OF GRAVITY

The strategic level center of gravity for al Qaeda is its RADICAL ISLAMIC FUNDAMENTALIST IDEOLOGY. This belief constitutes the spirit that permeates throughout the terrorist network and is the cornerstone, and justification for their actions.[39] Conveyed by sacred text and imparted via clerical authorities, this radical interpretation of Islamic fundamentalist ideology serves as the legitimizing and enduring force. "It (this ideology) is like a tree," says Colonel Fouad Allam, a former deputy director of the Egyptian state security department of terrorism, "when you cut only the branches but leave the roots. With a little water and fertilizer, the branches will grow again."[40]

Whereas Westerners look to the French and American revolutions as models for freedom from tyranny or the Magna Carta as a basic doctrine on good governance, in the Muslim world the Qur'an serves as a source for justice, humanity, good governance and opposition to corruption.[41] Sheikhs and fundamentalist religious scholars, especially those with radical ideals, selectively quote from the Qur'an to establish the basis for their *jihad* These ideologues influence that part of the Muslim public where religious knowledge is poorest (especially terrorists who lack an understanding of orthodox Islam), and focus their teachings (and justifications) on social and political confrontation. According to Sohail Hashmi, the fundamentalist's motivations appear to spring primarily from the same sort of anti-imperialism that motivates religious and non-religious groups in the Middle East and other parts of the world.[42] However, where the radical fundamentalist differs from these other groups is in the core belief that the division between politics and religion is a false one and that their religious beliefs are central to how they conceptualize the conflict and its resolution.[43]

9

The roots of radical Islamic fundamentalism lie in the search for the return to Islam's celebrated past in the Middle Ages. This world view dates back to a school in medieval Islam that spread throughout the Arab world in the 20th century, known as the *Salafiyya*.[44] Islamist or *jihadi* (holy war) terrorism is a product of this radical fundamentalist Islamic revival. It is a consolidation of a new version of *Wahhabi-Takfiri* ideology,[45] and is the result of an inability among Islamic societies to cope with ideas of modernization presented to them by the West. Central to this belief is the work of two 1930s radicals, Rashid Rida and Maulana Maudoodi, who argued that Islam was in real danger of being extinguished through Western influence. Their answer was to develop the notion that modern Western culture was equivalent to *jahiliyya* (the word is the Arabic term for the barbarism that existed before Islam).[46] This radical belief was further developed by the one man who deserves the title of intellectual grandfather to Osama bin Laden and his fellow terrorists, the Egyptian writer and activist Sayyid Qutb.[47] In his most popular book, "Signposts on the Road" (1964), Mr. Qutb wrote: "This is the most dangerous *jahiliyya* which has ever menaced our faith. For everything around is *jahiliyya*: perceptions and beliefs, manners and morals, culture, art and literature, laws and regulations, including a good part of what we consider Islamic culture."[48]

CRITICAL CAPABILITIES

Global Network. As of now, al Qaeda is the first and only group that combines religious motivation with the desire to cause maximum devastation and destruction to demonstrate its global capabilities. Al Qaeda spans dozens of countries, with perhaps thousands of trained and dedicated operatives working as part of hundreds of cells scattered around the globe.[49] In fact, many of al Qaeda's trainees over the years have been members of other militant Islamic groups loosely allied with al Qaeda in countries such as Algeria, Somalia, Uzbekistan, Pakistan and the Philippines. It is important to note that although Afghanistan has served as the base of operations for al Qaeda for years, destroying or disrupting this base will not necessarily eliminate the group's global reach.[50] The reason can be found in the radical ideology that motivates them and the very nature of a networked organization that makes them exceedingly difficult to penetrate. Furthermore, they have demonstrated adaptiveness and creativity in order to remain effectively closed.

According to Ian Lesser, the rise of networks means that power is migrating to non-state actors, who are able to organize into sprawling multi-organizational networks more readily than traditional, hierarchical, state actors.[51] This new organizational structure is referred to as NETWAR in which protagonists, consisting of dispersed, small groups who communicate,

coordinate, and conduct their campaigns in an internetted manner, without a precise central command use network forms of organization and related doctrines, strategies, and technologies attuned to the information age.[52] In fact, these non-state actor networks are thought to be more flexible and responsive than hierarchies in reacting to outside developments, and to be better than hierarchies at using information to improve decision making. In many respects, the archetypal NETWAR design corresponds to what earlier analysts called a "segmented, polycentric, ideologically integrated network (SPIN):

> By segmentary I mean that it is cellular, composed of many different groups.... By polycentric, I mean that it has many different leaders or centers of direction.... By networked I mean that the segments and the leaders are Integrated into reticulated systems or networks through various structural, personal, and ideological ties. Networks are usually unbounded and expanding.... This acronym (SPIN) helps us picture this organization as a fluid, dynamic, expanding one, spinning out into mainstream society."[53]

Financial Basis. Osama bin Laden has built al Qaeda into a worldwide force of money and men that in many ways resembles a major international conglomerate. It has hundreds of paid employees, specialized training programs, branches, affiliates or members in at least 50 nations, and it maintains accounts and conducts sophisticated financial transactions through banks from Switzerland and Sudan to Singapore. Al Qaeda uses an amalgam of private enterprises, corporate shells and charities that are structured like a financial archipelago with connections hidden beneath the surface.[54] In fact, al Qaeda's financial apparatus is so far-flung and diversified that it could survive even if bin Laden is captured or killed.

Without a doubt, al Qaeda is the best financed terrorist network in history. Based on government, court and banking records, plus interviews with investigators and finance experts, al Qaeda's annual revenue has been conservatively estimated at more than ten million U.S. dollars.[55] Unfortunately, terrorist money is hard to catch because many transactions fall below the radar screen. U.S. banks are designed to detect huge transfers by drug traffickers and other money launderers; but they are poorly suited to ferreting out the small, routine transactions of terrorist cells. Without advance knowledge of suspect accounts, spotting such transactions is all but impossible. This difficulty is compounded by the fact that al Qaeda receives a steady income from many sources, both legitimate and illegal:

- Direct contributions are a vital source. Supporters across the Middle East donate to bin Laden. According to investigators and intelligence officials, some wealthy Saudi businessmen and some Middle East countries make protection payments to prevent terrorist attacks.

11

- An international network of Islamic charities provides millions of dollars, sometimes without the knowledge of charity officials, investigators say. In some cases, the charities are legitimate organizations that allegedly have one or more branches infiltrated by al Qaeda members.

- Suspected front businesses, including three Middle East companies and an Italian religious center, have allegedly provided additional income and enabled al Qaeda to move money, weapons and men worldwide.

- Criminal enterprises, ranging from petty theft to the international opium and heroin trade.

- Transfers from legitimate banks, including a Sudanese bank that investigators believe may be controlled by bin Laden, enable al Qaeda to shift money to its operatives around the world. *Hawala*, an informal, largely undocumented money transfer system common in the Middle East, is also used.[56]

State Harboring. The benefits received from being harbored by a nation-state enhances the capabilities and operational capacity of terrorists groups by placing at their disposal the resources of an established nation-state's entire diplomatic, military, and intelligence apparatus and thus greatly facilitates planning and intelligence. New global terrorist organizations will also find refuge and support in countries that are sympathetic to their use of violence for political gain, that derive mutual benefit from harboring terrorists, or are simply weakly governed. Terrorists seek these safe havens to avoid the rule of law, prepare, train, raise funds, and operate. They seek logistical support in the means of false identification in the form of genuine passports, and potentially use embassies and other diplomatic facilities as safe houses or staging areas.

Unfortunately, reducing the number of sanctuaries does not necessarily mean that terrorism or the terrorist threat is going away; although one can effectively argue that it does affect their operational reach. Rather, if the terrorists do not have a safe place to hide, they are going to burrow themselves deeper into worldwide networks. As they lose their traditional sanctuaries, they will turn to transnational communities where they will burrow themselves and use the community as almost a remote base of operations, rather than having a set base in one part of the world.[57]

Fundamentalist Sheiks. Of all the critical capabilities, this one may be the most important because it is the one most directly tied to the center of gravity. Despite practicing a fringe form of radical Islamic fundamentalism that has been rejected by most Muslim scholars and the vast majority of Muslim clerics, these Sheiks nonetheless find a willing and receptive audience for their teachings.[58] Religion – conveyed by sacred text and imparted via clerical authorities

(fundamentalist Sheiks) claiming to speak for the divine – serves as a legitimizing force.[59] This explains why clerical sanction is so important to the religious terrorists, especially to the Muslims who practice this extreme version of Islam.

CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS/VULNERABILITIES

A fundamental critical requirement for al Qaeda is the reliance on information technology to advance their capabilities. This technology improves communication and aids organization, allows members to coordinate quickly with large numbers of followers, enables them to raise money, provides a platform for propaganda and to spread their dogma, assists in planning operations from afar and, finally, is used to launch cyber attacks. The difficulty for counter terrorism intelligence is that it is extremely complicated to accurately monitor the flow and content of Internet traffic. While the need for information technology can be seen as a critical vulnerability in and of itself, a more specific critical vulnerability of information technology is that as the terrorist organization increases the autonomy of its members, a network structure leads to diminished control over the numbers and kinds of communications that take place in the network. This increases entry opportunities for those outside the network because communicating is the greatest vulnerability of a clandestine organization.

Another critical requirement that is tied to the critical capabilities is Globalization. For decades, globalization has been understood to mean economic distribution. A significant by-product of this improvement in trade is the movement of people. Cheap air transport, the effects of decolonization and a population explosion in the poorer parts of the world have combined to create an unprecedented movement of humanity from one nation to another. While this freedom has provided honest opportunities to a number of people, it has also created safe havens for terrorists and a means to 'melt' into the masses until called upon. For example, the 11 September hijackers carried passports from Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Lebanon and in the years and months before the attack had lived or traveled in Germany, Spain, The Czech Republic, Malaysia, Canada, and a host of other countries.[60]

Globalization has also led to a Muslim Diaspora where highly skilled, middle class Muslims find a connection with the cause and provide indirect assistance or funding. In fact, private support for terrorist groups has become the most essential element in fund-raising, and the Muslim Diaspora provides a significant amount of this funding. However, Globalization also brings with it a number of vulnerabilities for terrorist organizations. Significantly, in the Islamic communities outside of the Middle East, honest families practice true Islam and find the radical Islamic ideology practiced by the extreme fundamentalists reprehensible. These honest families

13

deny safe havens in their communities. Globalization has also created a greater cooperation among national and international law enforcement agencies, as well as between major air/sea/rail transportation hubs.

The critical requirement to transfer funds in the International Banking System opens a number of vulnerabilities that if acted upon will reduce the funding net of the terrorist organization. These vulnerabilities range from tracking electronic transfers to targeting the financial records of known or suspected businesses that deal with terrorist organizations. The *hawalas* are not immune either as the recent blocking of accounts of a financial network called Al Barakaat, which owns an international collection of *hawalas*, has shown.[61]

For the terrorist, media access (Al Jazeera) is a critical requirement to getting their message out. The target audiences are those Muslims who share their ideology as well as those Moderate Arabs who sympathize with them and the perceived threat to their Islamic culture. Media is business, and news organizations will give attention to stories that attract viewers and readers. In the mind of the terrorist, "the media and the public have become progressively inured or desensitized to the seemingly endless litany of successive terrorists incidents; thus a continuing upward ratcheting of violence is required in order to retain media and public interest and attention."[62] However, critical vulnerabilities would be a message that is not well received (too much violence), a messenger who has damaged his reputation, or the message itself is misunderstood or misinterpreted.

Table 1 summarizes what was discussed in this section. Attacking the critical vulnerabilities, and those critical requirements susceptible to attack, of al Qaeda may not lead to the destruction of its center of gravity, but one can argue that the success of these attacks may lead to neutralizing those capabilities that give strength to the center of gravity. Destroying a belief is difficult. Eliminating their ability to export this belief as well as eliminating their ability to function as a cogent global network however, may ultimately neutralize their radical fundamentalist ideology as a catalyst for their actions.

14

CENTER OF GRAVITY	CRITICAL CAPABILITIES	CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS	CRITICAL VULNERABILITIES
Radical Islamic Fundamentalist Ideology	*Global Network *Financial Basis *State Harboring *Fundamentalist Sheiks	*Info Technology *Globalization *Muslim Diaspora *International Banking System *Hawalas *Safe Haven *Media Access (Al Jazeera) *Moderate Arab Sympathizers	*Communication Links *Increased autonomy of network *International Cooperation *Electronic Transfers *Businesses *True Islam *Misunderstood Message *Honest Muslims

TABLE 1 THREAT CENTER OF GRAVITY ANALYSIS

FRIENDLY CENTER OF GRAVITY ANALYSIS

CENTER OF GRAVITY

The friendly strategic level center of gravity is the WILL OF THE INTERNATIONAL COALITION. The global threat represented by al Qaeda demands a global response, and the long-term multifaceted campaign against global terrorism will require that the "will" and the attention of the international coalition remain as strong tomorrow as it is today. This is more important now than it has ever been in the past because there may never be one single monolithic coalition or grouping of nations as witnessed in Desert Shield/Desert Storm. In fact, as this campaign continues over time the "will" of the international coalition will be tested more often than has any ad hoc or standing coalition or alliance in the past. Whereas the objective of the campaign may be agreed upon, the means to achieving the objective will severely test even the most stalwart of international partners. For example, the operations in Afghanistan have not tested the coalition because it is universally accepted that the United States has an inherent right to protect its citizens and to respond to an openly aggressive attack on its sovereignty. The test will come when the United States conducts operations that violate the sovereign borders of those countries that have legitimate relationships with members of the coalition.

The international "will" will further be tested as the coalitions change and the contributions to the operation vary from overt military support to covert cooperation supporting sensitive actions. Furthermore, standing alliances will be tested both collectively as a group and as individual nation-states.[63] For instance, not every nation-state will be providing the same level

of support, and as the war continues, this support will vary depending on the operations conducted. What is important is that the coalition does not compare and contrast a nation-state's contribution to the overall effort. In fact, U.S. diplomats say that the coalition will most likely resemble a series of four concentric rings, or separate coalitions, wrapped around the U.S.:

> Only the inner ring of countries – likely to include Britain, France, Germany and Australia – would chip in troops and warplanes. A second ring of seven or so countries would provide important logistical and intelligence support. A third ring of countries, most of them Muslim, would offer important behind-thescenes political support aimed at keeping opposition in Arab countries and Pakistan to a minimum. Finally, a fourth ring of countries, such as Israel, Iran, and India would be counted on mostly to avoid stirring up trouble for the other members of the coalition.[64]

CRITICAL CAPABILITIES

United States Leadership. As the previous discussion demonstrated, success in this campaign requires a broad and enthusiastic coalition that is willing to conduct the operations necessary to achieve the objective. The importance of the United States' leadership role in maintaining this international coalition and providing the impetus for continued action cannot be overstated. United States leadership is a critical capability because the U.S. is arguably the only nation-state capable of establishing a new vision of cooperation among a wide variety of domestic agencies and international communities. However, this does not mean that the United States should take the lead in all aspects of this campaign. Nevertheless, the U.S. will be responsible for rallying and sustaining a coalition of coalitions, each responsible for tackling a different part of the broad campaign, and recruiting countries and organizations to take the lead on some of the efforts at the earliest possible stages of the campaign. Most importantly, U.S. leadership will be responsible for maintaining the support of the American people; a requirement that is not only necessary domestically, but also necessary internationally in that it will be seen as a demonstration of resolve.

Open/Honest Communication. If the U.S. is to lead the international coalition against global terrorism, then it is incumbent upon U.S. leadership to be as open and honest in the conduct of the campaign as is reasonably permissible. This is necessary because the International Coalition must be viewed by the global community as legitimate. The leaders of the U.S. government have already been doing this with the daily briefings and up front acknowledgements of successes, failures, issues, and concerns. In fact, Secretary Rumsfeld made a point to specify that he and his department will always be honest and will never mislead,

16

or purposely divulge inaccurate information, to justify actions. More importantly, the leadership of the U.S. must be viewed, not only by the world but also by its own citizens, as practicing the democratic principles that have made the U.S. strong in the first place. Only open and honest communication between coalition members and among the world population will keep the coalition together and the "will" and perseverance strong.

Belief in Cause. Although at first blush this capability may seem obvious, it is nonetheless a very important aspect in keeping the coalition together. There is very little disagreement in the international community that the criminal acts as perpetrated by global terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda are the leach that sucks the spirit out of international cooperation and interaction. There is also recognition that ridding the world of al Qaeda while simultaneously removing the reason for their existence (root causes) will benefit the international community as a whole. Prevailing in the global war on terrorism must be the international community's primary, immediate priority. This requires strength of conviction that the cause is, and remains, necessary to maintaining the social order of the civilized world.

The important point is to ensure that the objective to destroy terrorism of global reach is not overwhelmed by, for example, the desire to limit the production of weapons of mass destruction. Tying other policy objectives into the terrorism cause is tricky at best, and will be devastating to the coalition if it is perceived that national agendas are overriding international concurrence. Secondly, belief in the cause rests on attacking terrorist organizations and not attacking the Islamic faith. Separating the two is not only important, but also necessary in ensuring the support of a significant global population.

Shared Intelligence. International cooperation in this venue will be a key critical capability. Shared intelligence is the central element on which the success of the campaign hinges. The cooperation of the intelligence services of every friend and ally the U.S. can muster will greatly magnify the coalition's strength. Given the nature of the adversary, the strong ideological beliefs of its members, the cultural idiosyncrasies, and the dispersion of his operations, the international intelligence community will require unprecedented cooperation and trust. More specifically, to break into the terrorist network, whether through communication intercepts or through human operatives, will require a significant intelligence dissemination network that is a proactive combination of both a push and pull system. Both analytically and operationally, one can contend that if there is a "fog of war" there most certainly is a "smog of terrorism," which makes it particularly difficult to look through a very opaque analytical crystal ball.[65] However, with shared intelligence and international cooperation, anything is possible and this "smog of

war" may dissipate to a degree that it will be possible to anticipate future terrorists' motives and actions.

CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS/VULNERABILITIES

It can be argued that public support of an extended campaign is chiefly a function of the mission's perceived stakes, the prospects for victory and the anticipated costs. In fact, the public will support such a campaign provided the stakes warrant it and the U.S. leadership can persuasively promise victory. To prevail in this campaign, Americans will have to be more determined, focused, committed and patient than they ever have been before. In the end, victory will require that the American people sustain the purpose and resolve in the face of repeated unthinkable attacks, or in the absence of them, possibly for years to come.[66] The vulnerability will be a perceived lack of direction by the U.S. government or a confusing definition of what victory entails.[67] If the U.S. leadership fails to define victory adequately, then this requirement may be left up to the media who will define victory using different parameters of success; possibly low allied body counts or speed in achieving objectives. Although questioning the government is a necessary characteristic in a democratic society, it can also be detrimental if the government fails to justify or merit its actions based on an easily understood set of criteria.

Another critical requirement worth discussing is the determination of the international community's leadership in supporting the international campaign. This requirement goes directly to the maintenance of the international community's "will" to see this campaign through to its successful conclusion. The vulnerability is that whereas there is concurrence among the international leaders as to the importance of this global effort, there also exists the requirement to ensure that each nation's concerns and issues are addressed as well. This is particularly applicable in the case of those Middle Eastern nation-states who must constantly convince their citizens that the war is not against Islam but against those who blasphemy the Islamic ideology. A second vulnerability is the support when international actions are taken that may contradict individual nation-state concerns. For example, the use of military action that violates the sovereign borders of a neighbor nation-state when the perceived justification for such action runs counter to domestic beliefs. This will test the determination and resolve of that nation-state's leadership to convince its citizens and to remain within the coalition.

A significant requirement, and a critical vulnerability in its own right, is time. Time as a critical vulnerability transcends a number of requirements to include the determination of the leadership, support of the American people, confidence in achieving victory, and intelligence. The longer this campaign goes the harder it will be to maintain international and domestic focus.

Case in point is the War on Drugs; which kills, maims, and ruins more lives a year than does terrorism. Despite the fanfare at the start of the campaign on the war on drugs nine years ago, the emphasis has been reduced to a by-line in the government's budget and a footnote in the daily news. Time is a vulnerability that should not be taken lightly. Its impact will reverberate throughout the campaign if not controlled.

Some of the critical requirements and vulnerabilities listed in Table 2 are not only vulnerable from outside the coalition, but are equally vulnerable from inside the coalition. Some vulnerabilities, such as identifying strategic direction and defining coalition victory, that are not adequately addressed, can have a far reaching impact on those nation-states vulnerable to internal criticism. There are also vulnerabilities that cannot be protected per se, as in globalization, but if not considered in the development of a strategy can have dire ramifications. Finally, there are critical requirements and vulnerabilities that can be protected by the center of gravity, such as maintaining focus, addressing root causes, and developing the means and resources to share intelligence, that can go a long way to dissuade, deter, and defeat terrorist networks.

CENTER OF GRAVITY	CRITICAL CAPABILITIES	CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS	CRITICAL VULNERABILITIES
Will of the International Coalition	*U.S. Leadership	*Leadership determination	*Lack of Strategic Direction *Defining Coalition Victory/Endstate
	*Open/Honest Communication	*Maintain confidence in ultimate victory or success	*Internal support of Coalition Governments
		*Resources/Means to receive Intelligence	*Conflicting nation-state agendas
	*Belief in Cause	*Open Media	*Lack of credible HUMINT *Globalization
	*Shared Intelligence	*Support of American People	*Maintaining Focus
			*Successfully addressing Root Causes
		*Time	

TABLE 2 FRIENDLY CENTER OF GRAVITY ANALYSIS

THREAT RESPONSE STRATEGY

The strategy of the terrorist organization, as well as the weapons they favor, is shaped by their ideology, internal organizational dynamics, and the personalities of its key members, as well as a variety of internal and external stimuli. For the terrorist, a combination of solid training,

sound planning, good intelligence, and technological competence are the essential prerequisites for a successful campaign. Furthermore, the direction in which their strategy evolves will depend upon the choices they make as to their overall doctrinal paradigms. The three paradigms discussed by Ian Lesser are the 'Coercive-Diplomacy Paradigm,' the 'War Paradigm,' and the 'New World Paradigm.'[68] The paradigm that is commonly believed to be shaping this new terrorism strategy is the 'War Paradigm.' The 'War Paradigm' is one in which terrorist acts arise when weaker parties cannot challenge an adversary directly and thus turn to asymmetric methods. The strategic aim is to inflict as much damage as possible (systemic disruption and/or target destruction), without necessarily claiming credit, in the context of what the terrorists view as an ongoing war.[69]

In the case of al Qaeda, it is evident that they have adopted the 'War Paradigm' as the doctrinal basis for the development of their strategy. This strategic direction can be found in the 'fatwa' issued by Usama bin Laden on 23 February 1998. This 'fatwa' calls for a defensive struggle against Americans and their allies who had declared war "on God, his messenger, and Muslims."[70] The objective of the 'fatwa' is to get the United States to disengage completely from the Middle East by inducing fear in the general public, which turns into pressure on the U.S. government. Bruce Hoffman believes that there is an additional goal, one that has not been worked into the public discussions of al Qaeda's actions. This goal centers on the intent of trying to start a civil war, or series of civil wars, in the Middle East.[71] In this view, bin Laden wants, in the short run, to help his radical Islamist allies start insurgencies, and in the long run he wants these insurgencies to get control of the national governments of as many Muslim countries as possible.[72]

What does this overall strategic direction mean to the development of a response strategy in reaction to the international coalition arrayed against al Qaeda? The difficulty in predicting a future strategy lies in the fact that al Qaeda does not have a set modus operandi. Opportunism drives their actions more than following a set target list. "The terrorist campaign is like a shark in the water; it must keep moving forward no matter how slowly or incrementally, or it will die."[73] In that light, terrorists also recognize that their survival means staying one step ahead of what their enemies are doing and one step ahead of the counter terrorism technology curve. As terrorism scholar Yonah Alexander said, "It would be folly to rely on the previous pattern of attacks by al Qaeda. They are in the midst of a war; the time to strike is any time. Instead of a big spectacular attack, there could be smaller ones. There is no end to the possibilities."[74]

Future strategy will not vary far from the initial objectives stated in the 1998 'fatwa.' Al Qaeda's strategy will continue to exploit exposed seams and vulnerabilities in the international

coalition itself, as well as the democratic principles espoused by the United States. The re-emergence of the Israeli-Palestinian issue plays into the hands of the terrorists if the United States, and the Western Nations, continue to support Israel to the detriment of the Palestinian people. Al Qaeda generally experiences a favorable media environment in the Middle East. As such, they will continue to emphasize that the west continues to attack Islam not only in the Middle East, but also around the world by curtailing the basic rights of Muslims in western countries. Al Qaeda will conduct, in the near term, computer attacks that seek to disrupt operations on a global scale. Finally, al Qaeda will continue to seek weapons of mass destruction as well as aligning themselves with those failed, or failing states that may provide some level of sanctuary.

FRIENDLY RESPONSE STRATEGY

How will the United States win this war? "We will direct every resource at our command – every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war – to the disruption and to the defeat of the global terror network."[75] The blueprint for such a campaign, and the foundation from which President Bush's strategy is developing, is currently resident in a number of government documents. The 2000 National Security Strategy provides a general overview of the role each element of national power will play in combating terrorism. In support of this document are the U.S. Department of Defense's 1997 National Military Strategy and 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review Report, and the U.S. Department of State's Patterns of Global Terrorism-2000. President Clinton's Presidential Decision Directive-39 "U.S. Pdicy on Counter terrorism," signed on 21 June 1995, specifically tasks individual Departments and Agencies in reducing United States vulnerabilities, deterring terrorism, and responding to terrorist acts. Together, all of these documents spell out a U.S. strategy to deter, defeat and respond vigorously to all terrorist attacks on U.S. territory, against its citizens, or facilities, whether they occur domestically, in international waters or airspace or on foreign territory.[76]

The most significance difference between previous counter terrorism strategy efforts and President Bush's emerging strategy is the prioritization of the nation's resources in support of the current strategy. The core dimensions of President Bush's counter terrorism strategy will therefore need to be supported by a range of policies aimed at containing near term risks while fostering the conditions for overall success. According to Kurt Campbell and Michele Flournoy, the overarching goals of the United States in the campaign should be to reduce the threat of global terrorism, to enhance the security of Americans at home and abroad, and to sustain the

resoluteness of U.S. and international purpose. The specific objectives of the campaign, they state, are clear:

> To attack and destroy global terrorist networks; to punish states sponsoring terrorism until they stop; to build stronger capabilities to combat terrorism and secure the U.S. homeland; to strengthen international norms and actions against terrorism; and, over time, to ameliorate the conditions that provide fertile ground for terrorists.[77]

Further objectives, specifically aimed at eliminating the root causes of terrorism, would be to sustain global economic growth and development, to provide humanitarian relief, to rebuild failed states and, arguably one of the most important objectives, to support moderate Islam and their contribution to a stable world.[78] These objectives will be accomplished by applying each element of national power in a coordinated, cohesive, and simultaneous manner. The following provides general considerations for developing a strategic campaign that capitalizes on the coalition's strengths while directly and indirectly protecting its vulnerabilities.

Diplomatic. There are three obvious components to a successful diplomatic strategy: continue to sustain the international coalition, discourage those countries that may be tempted to harbor terrorists, and resolve the Israeli-Palestinian issue. This last component has a number of underlying issues that, if not resolved to the satisfaction of the interested parties, threatens to destroy the collective international campaign against terrorism. Furthermore, this diplomatic effort needs to look beyond the immediate requirements of the war on terrorism and pursue policies that directly address the fundamental causes of the disenfranchisement felt by a large faction of the global population. Finally, this effort will require a significant commitment to nation building in terms of galvanizing support through international organizations.

Military. The United States has a right and a duty to protect its citizens, including the unilateral use of military power. Indeed, effective military action that achieves broadly accepted objectives and limits collateral damage has the potential to enhance U.S. credibility and leadership in other areas as well.[79] That said, the application of military power needs to be applied judiciously and in concert with the other three elements of national power. The misapplication of this arm of the U.S. government will severely restrict the U.S. ability to mobilize key coalition members, and may alienate future coalition members from participating in other arenas. Furthermore, U.S. military actions will create the template in which other countries will use to address their terrorist threats. To fail here will severely jeopardize the overall campaign.

Economic. The economic strategy is focused not only on destroying the international financial apparatus of the global terrorist organizations, but also on encouraging, and at times

coercing, border states to join the coalition and cease their support of terrorist activities. In this regard, it is possible to use sanctions[80] and incentives to develop a strategy of "in group policing", in which a larger religious or ethnic community or government is induced to control its more radical and violent members.[81] This type of strategy will require that the U.S. deal with moderate elements that it may not have dealt with in the past. A secondary effect of this policy is that the U.S. will need to support failed, or failing, states and assist them on re-entering the global community. Only then will the temptation of these states to harbor terrorists for financial stability be eliminated.

Informational. To prevail in the war on terrorism, and then to secure the peace, the United States must embark upon an information campaign unprecedented in history. It must convey the righteousness of this international cause in a manner that does not alenate a particular ethnic or religious group. If the war on terrorism ends up being a war on behalf of entrenched regimes against even peaceful local Islamist movements (or strengthening Israeli control over Palestinians), it is likely to engender a lot of suspicion about the real U.S. agenda.[82] Therefore, the focus of effort in the informational campaign needs to be directed towards the Islamic population and, more specifically, towards the moderate Arabs in the Middle East. Through its own words, the United States must communicate the U.S. side of the story more effectively and, in the process, listen to the concerns and issues of the questioning populace.[83] Only in this manner will the United States gain, and maintain, the credibility necessary to remain the leaders in this campaign.

CONCLUSION

Defining terrorism in such a manner that pleases the international community is, as the evidence has shown, nearly impossible. Yet, this is an important criterion if the correct strategy is to be developed and the international community is to implement it. The international community must come to some level of agreement so as not to allow every entrenched government to take unwarranted actions against its citizens in the name of the current global threat. By recognizing the terrorist act itself as criminal, by adopting Bruce Hoffman's characterizations of terrorism and Grant Wardlaw's definition, and by understanding the reason for, while acknowledging the purpose of, a strategy of terrorism, the internationalcommunity will be able to develop a strategy that not only addresses the criminal aspect, but also addresses eliminating the root cause that breeds terrorism and supports terrorist organizations.

Al Qaeda's strategic level center of gravity is not fleeting nor is it transitory. It has been forged over time and tested in a variety of environments under a number of situations. It has

23

withstood the test of time and circumstance. This radical fundamentalist ideology permeates throughout the Islamic culture at different societal levels, at varying strengths, and in separate locations around the world. It cannot be destroyed, but its influence can be reduced in importance. The focus for the international coalition should be to attack those critical requirements and vulnerabilities that directly chip away at the critical capabilities. The key component in this strategy is to energize the moderate Islamic citizen and cleric in order to minimize the radical fundamentalist impact in their community. Furthermore, it is incumbent upon the international community to address the democratic and poverty issues that inundate the countries in which this ideology takes hold. Only then will this center of gravity be neutralized.

The coalition's strategic level center of gravity, on the other hand, is extremely fragile for all of the obvious reasons: a wide range of nation-states with a wider ranger of interests, a perception that this is a 'clash of civilizations', differing recommendations on the strategic direction and the means to achieving the objectives, and internal issues affecting nation-state contributions and support. As such, those critical capabilities that give strength to the center of gravity will be the same that must protect its critical vulnerabilities. This protection is as vital inside the coalition as it is against al Qaeda. Most importantly, United States leadership is the most vital critical capability to ensuring that the international coalition remains focused on destroying not only al Qaeda, but also terrorism of global reach as a whole. Without this leadership, the coalition will surely disintegrate and the global war on terrorism will become more difficult to prosecute.

WORD COUNT = 9,957

[1] Bruce Hoffman, Inside Terrorism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 94.

[2] Four major reasons contribute to the absence of a standard commonly acceptable and readily applicable definition of terrorism. First, there is the multiplicity of current and potential definers. These include government officials, academic experts private sector entrepreneurs, the media, the identified targets of terrorism, the perpetrators of the terrorist act, and the general public. Second, some of the aforementioned definers initiate their own definitions and campaign for an acceptance of their definition. Third is the inherent political nature of terrorism and the influence politics has on accepting or rejecting its legitimacy. Fourth, there is the social-psychological nature where an observer's predispositions and perceptions outweigh an unbiased position. Henry H. Han, Terrorism and Political Violence: Limits and Possibilities of Legal Control (New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1993), 14.

[3] These two concepts have entirely different strategic implications. If terrorism is dealt with as a 'criminal act' the strategy adopted would be "concerned with gathering evidence, correctly determining the culpability of the individuals responsible for a particular act, and apprehending and bringing the perpetrators to trial." However, there are a number of problems with this interpretation of terrorism: "Evidence is extremely difficult to gather in an international investigation where all countries may not cooperate with the investigators. Apprehending terrorists abroad is also difficult. Moreover, the criminal approach does not provide an entirely satisfactory response to a continuing campaign of terrorism waged by a distant group, and it may not work against a state sponsor of terrorism." On the other hand, if terrorism is dealt with as an 'act of war' then the U.S. will be less concerned with individual culpability. "Proximate responsibility will do and the U.S. may be less fastidious about evidence. It need not be of courtroom quality; intelligence reporting will suffice. The focus is not on the accused individual but on the correct identification of the enemy." However, military force (or actions at wartime) can result in innocent or friendly casualties; "it can create terrorist martyrs and provoke retaliation; it can alienate worldwide public opinion and reduce international cooperation; and declaring war on terrorists leaders puts the U.S. into open ended asymmetrical contests." Ian O. Lesser et al., Countering the New Terrorism (Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1999), xii.

[4] For the purposes of the definition, the term 'noncombatant' is interpreted to include, in addition to civilians, military personnel who at the time of the incident are unarmed or not on duty. Furthermore, acts of terrorism also include attacks on military installations or on armed military personnel when a state of military hostilities does not exist at the site, such as bombings against U.S. bases in Europe, the Philippines, or elsewhere. U.S. Department of State, Patterns of Global Terrorism 1999 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of State, April 2000), introduction.

[5] Terrorist Research and Analytical Center, National Security Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Terrorism in the United States 1995 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1996), ii. Found in Hoffman, 38.

[6] Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms Joint Publication 1-02 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, 10 June 1998), 452.

[7] Hoffman, 39-40.

[8] Walter Laqueur, The Age of Terrorism (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1987), 4.

[9] Hoffman, 31.

[10] Ibid.

[11] The Third World delegates justified their position with two arguments. First, they claimed that all bona fide liberation movements are invariably decried as 'terrorists' by the regimes against which their struggles for freedom are directed. Therefore, by condemning 'terrorism' the UN was endorsing the power of the strong over the weak and of the established entity over its non-established challenger – in effect, acting as the defender of the status quo. Second, the Third World delegates argued forcefully that it is not the violence itself that is germane, but its 'underlying causes:' that is the 'misery, frustration, grievance and despair' that produce the violent acts. As the Mauritanian representative again explained, the term 'terrorist' could 'hardly be held to apply to persons who were denied the most elementary human rights, dignity, freedom and independence, and whose countries objected to foreign occupation.' Ibid., 31-32.

[12] The final report of the 1989 North Atlantic Assembly's Subcommittee on Terrorism states: 'Murder, kidnapping, arson and other felonious acts constitute criminal behavior, but many non-Western nations have proved reluctant to condemn as terrorist acts what they consider to be struggles of national liberations.' Ibid., 32.

[13] Lesser, v.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Hoffman, 43. However, in his book The Hotel New Hampshire, John Irving likens the terrorist to the pornographer. "The pornographer pretends he is disgusted by his work; the terrorist pretends he is uninterested in the means. The ends, they say, are what they care about. But they are both lying. …It is never the ends that matter – it is *only the means that matter*. The terrorist and the pornographer are in it *for the means*. The means is everything to them. The blast of the bomb, the elephant position…they love it all. Their intellectual detachment is a fraud; their difference is feigned. They both tell lies about having 'higher purposes.' A terrorist *is a pornographer*." John Irving, The Hotel New Hampshire (New York: Dutton, 1982). Found in Han, 20.

[16] Hoffman, 33.

[17] These rules of war have been observed from the early seventeenth century when they were first proposed by the Dutch jurist Hugo Grotius and subsequently codified in the famous Geneva and Hague Conventions on Warfare of the 1860s, 1899, 1907, and 1949. Specifically, these rules of war not only grant civilian non-combatants immunity from attack, but also "prohibit taking civilians as hostages; impose regulations governing the treatment of captured or surrendered soldiers; outlaw reprisals against either civilians or POWs; recognize neutral territory and the rights of citizens of neutral states; and uphold the inviolability of diplomats and other accredited representatives." Ibid., 34.

[18] Ibid., 35. The 11 September 2001 attack on the World Trade Centers and the Pentagon "violate the laws of war because terrorists entered the United States with a secret purpose to commit acts of sabotage that resulted in the deaths of thousands of Americans and massive destruction. The attack is a crime against humanity because of its focus on an unsuspecting population not engaged in an armed conflict, and it is a crime against peace because of its nature as a surprise attack constituting the opening volley of a war on America." Peter S. Latham, J.D. and Patricia Horan Latham, J.D., "Terrorists: Criminals or Soldiers?" Armed Forces Journal International (January 2002): 14. These attacks violate the 1977 Protocols to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, adopted 8 June 1977 that "prohibit attacks against the civilian population in territory under the control of an adverse party intended to break civilian morale and thus to intimidate them to exert pressure on the authorities to alter their course of action in some way advantageous to the attacker." Furthermore, the attacks violate the Protocol that states it is "unlawful to place pressure against civilians in the hands of the part to the conflict in order to extort from them, or from third persons some concessions." Protocol-I, Article 51; Protocol Additional to the Geneva conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol-II, Article 13), adopted 8 June 1977 (U.N. Document G.A.A./32/144, 15 August 1977). Found in Han, 319.

[19] Ibid., 41. Walter Laqueur further states "while guerrillas have quite frequently used terrorist tactics vis-à-vis their enemies, the opposite has virtually never happened." Lacqueur, 5.

[20] Hoffman, 42.

[21] After his lengthy discussion on the topic in his book Inside Terrorism, Dr. Bruce Hoffman defines terrorism as: "The deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change. All terrorist acts involve violence or the threat of violence. Terrorism is specifically designed to have far-reaching psychological effects beyond the immediate victim(s) or object of the terrorist attack. It is meant to instill fear within, and thereby intimidate, a wider 'target audience' that might include a rival ethnic or religious group, an entire country, a national government or political party, or public opinion in general. Terrorism is designed to create power where there is none or to consolidate power where there is very little. Through the publicity generated by their violence, terrorists seek to obtain the leverage, influence and power they otherwise lack to effect political change on either a local or an international scale." Ibid., 43-44. Throughout this author's research, there were a number of definitions on terrorism. A short definition that this author believes best captures the characteristics of terrorism is provided by Grant Wardlaw: "Terrorism is the use, or the threat of use, of violence by an individual or a group, whether acting for or in opposition to established authority, when such action is designed to create extreme anxiety and/or fear inducing effects in a target group wider than the immediate victims with the purpose of coercing that group into acceding to the political demands of the perpetrators." Grant Wardlaw, Political Terrorism: Theory, Tactics and Counter-measure (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 16. Found in Han, 132.

[22] Terrorism is a "means to create a mental state, a way of forcing one's views on the consciousness of others, a way of breaking down the insularity and security of both individuals and groups by using different acts of carnage to create an agenda of fear in the minds of its immediate and potential victims." In fact, Terrorism is a form of Psychological Operations because terrorism is primarily aimed not at the victims, but at the people watching. Han, 131.

27

[23] Dr. Shireen Hunter, Director of the Islam Program at The Center for Strategic and International Studies, points to a number of disturbing trends in the evolution of Islamic extremism and its regional and international networks. First, the new brand of extremists is both ideologically less sophisticated, more inflexible and more dogmatic. The core of their ideology is a distorted version of the concept of *Jihad*, hence their identification as *Jihadists*. Second, this particular brand of Islamic extremists has its roots in the Afghan conflicts, the Russo-Afghan War and the Afghan Civil War. In addition, many member and/or sympathizers of this brand have been hardened by doing battle elsewhere, including recent conflicts such as Bosnia, Chechnya and in the Tajik Civil War (1992-1997). This type of engagement in warlike situations has provided the new breed of extremists with military training skills, hitherto unavailable to them, including flying sophisticated aircraft. Third, the Afghan War and other conflicts, notably those in Bosnia and Chechnya, have given rise to a geographically widespread network of extremists who have common experiences. Fourth, the *Jihadist* trend has found sympathizers among Muslims who have not had direct involvement in any of the above-mentioned conflicts, including a very small section of the Muslim Diaspora in Europe and the United States. Such sympathizers could potentially be very important links in the chain of extremist networks and their ability to perpetrate terrorists acts. Dr. Shireen Hunter, "New Trends in Islamic Extremism," Center of Strategic and International Studies September 12, 2001; available from <http://csis.org/features/nyterror_hunter.htm>; Internet; accessed 15 November 2001.

[24] Nicholas Lemann, "What Terrorists Want," New Yorker 29 October 2001; available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/s20011024whaterrorists.htm>; Internet; accessed 30 October 2001.

[25] Christopher C. Harmon, Characteristics of the Militant International, Oral testimony to the House Committee on Government Reform, 107th sess. (Washington D.C., 20 September 2001).

[26] Carl von Clausewitz, On War, edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1976), 595-596.

[27] Dr. Joe Strange disagrees with this premise. He posits that centers of gravity are not characteristics, capabilities, or locations; they are the moral, political and physical entities which possess certain characteristics and capabilities, or benefit from a given location/terrain. He further argues that if we apply the term "center of gravity" only to certain characteristics, capabilities or locations that affect designated military forces, then what do we call the military forces themselves? Dr. Joe Strange, Centers of Gravity & Critical Vulnerabilities: Building on the Clausewitzian Foundation So That We Can All Speak the Same Language, Marine Corps University Perspectives on Warfighting, Number Four, 2d ed., (Quantico, Virginia: Defense Automated Printing Service Center, 1996), 25.

[28] Glenn Cunningham, "War Room Report 42-01, 26 October 2001," electronic mail message to James Reilly <James.Reilly@carlisle.army.mil>, 29 October 2001.

[29] Joint and Service doctrine manuals/publications reflect a hugely divergent and confusing array of interpretations regarding Center of Gravity and its relationship to Critical Vulnerabilities. While some service doctrines emphasize that there can be more than one center of gravity at any one time, others emphasize that it is only possible to have one at any given time, yet that one center of gravity can, and usually does, change as the operation progresses. Some service

publications emphasize the targeting of the center of gravity as a critical vulnerability while other service publications indicate that the center of gravity is a strength and that it is not feasible to attack the enemy's strength. This author believes that the purpose of Center of Gravity analysis is to identify both friendly and enemy strengths and weaknesses so as to develop a course of action that capitalizes on the friendly strength to attack the enemy weakness. It is the application of this analysis to the conduct of an operation that represents operational art.

[30] Major Phillip Kevin Giles and Captain Thomas Patrick Galvin, Center of Gravity: Determination, Analysis, and Application, Center for Strategic Leadership (Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 31 January 1996), 12.

[31] Cunningham.

[32] A Tactical Center of Gravity could be a key command post, a key piece of terrain, a specific military unit or formation. At the Operational Level, the Center of Gravity could be the mass of an enemy force, the boundary between two major combat formations, a vital command and control center, a vital Logistics Base or Line of Communication, a Leader, cohesion among allied forces, or a specific military unit or formation.

[33] Giles and Galvin, 18.

[34] A strategic critical capability may be an operational level center of gravity for a specific phase in the overall campaign. Once that phase is complete, and operations shift from one geographic area to another or from one functional area to another, then the center of gravity, or critical capabilities/requirements, for that specific operation may change as well. For example, as this campaign continues and nation-states recognize that harboring al Qaeda operatives will result in international condemnation and isolation, the critical capability, and its associated critical requirements, will disappear. Additionally, as the International Coalition becomes more familiar with al Qaeda operations, additional critical capabilities may be identified, and in the ongoing analysis process, may replace existing capabilities/requirements. Finally, once al Qaeda has been neutralized, or destroyed, and attention shifts to similar organizations with global capabilities, then the enemy strategic center of gravity may consequently change.

[35] Since its initial printing over a year ago, Dr. Strange's monograph has stimulated the study and discussion of this important subject throughout the Marine Corps. Dr. Strange's analytical construct has been incorporated into the Marine Air-ground Task Force Staff Training Program course provided to Marine Expeditionary Force headquarters staffs, and into draft Marine Corps doctrine. Strange, vi.

[36] Ibid., ix.

[37] "Center of gravity and critical vulnerability are complementary concepts. The former looks at the problem of how to attack the enemy system from the perspective of seeking a source of strength, the latter from the perspective of seeking weakness. A critical vulnerability is a pathway to attacking a center of gravity. Both have the same underlying purpose: to target our actions in such a way as to have the greatest effect on the enemy." Department of the Navy, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Warfighting, Marine Corps Doctrinal Publication – 1 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of the Navy, 20 June 1997), 47.

[38] Strange, 34; as referenced in FM 100-5, May 1986.

[39] "The contemplation of wholesale acts of violence is a direct reflection of this ideology. In fact, the belief that violent struggle is divinely mandated underlies the defining characteristic of this ideology. They do not seek to appeal to any constituency or authority other than their own beliefs and therefore feel little need to regulate or calibrate their violence. Comparatively small in number, limited in capabilities, isolated from society and dwarfed by both the vast resources of their enemy and the enormity of their task, they function in an inverted reality where the sought-after, ardently pursued future defines their existence, rather than the oppressive, angst-driven, and incomplete present. For them, their eventual victory is as inevitable as it is predetermined because the inherent righteousness of their cause itself assures success. Their future is divinely decreed and they see themselves specifically anointed to achieve it." Dr. Bruce Hoffman, "The Modern Terrorist Mindset: Tactics, Targets and Technologies," Columbian International Affairs Online October 1997; available from <http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/hob03/>; Internet; accessed 24 September 2001.

[40] Neil MacFarquhar, "Islamic Jihad, Forged in Egypt, Is Seen as bin Laden's Backbone," New York Times 4 October 2001; available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011004islamic.htm>; Internet; accessed 16 October 2001.

[41] Graham E. Fuller, "Geopolitics: Separating Terrorism from Politics will be Tough," Patriot-News, 23 September 2001, sec B, p. 17. Graham Fuller is a former vice chairman of the National Intelligence Council at the CIA. He was a political officer at the U.S. Embassy in Kabul from 1975-1978.

[42] Sohail Hashmi, "Where are They Coming From: The Terrorists' Zealotry is Political Not Religious," The Washington Post, 30 September 2001, sec B, p. 1.

[43] Kurt M. Campbell and Michele A. Flournoy, To Prevail: An American Strategy for the Campaign Against Terrorism, The Center for Strategic and International Studies (Washington D.C.: the CSIS Press, 2001), 298.

[44] Salafiyya comes from the Arabic words al-salaf al-salih, "the venerable forefathers," which refers to the generation of the Prophet Muhammad and his companions. The salifis believed Islam had been corrupted by idolatry, and they sought to bring it back to the purity of its earliest days. Robert Worth, "The Deep Intellectual Roots of Islamic Terror," The New York Times 13 October 2001, available from <http://proquest.umi.com>; Internet; accessed 10 December 2001.

[45] This new ideological trend consolidates the basic extreme orthodox Wahhabi perceptions developed during Saudi history, with the Egyptian Islamist perception of the excommunication of all other trends in Muslim societies. Takfiri follows an extremist Islamic ideology called Takfir wal Hijra (Anathema and Exile). The ideology is particularly dangerous because it provides a religious justification for slaughtering not just unbelievers but also those who think of themselves as Muslim. Intensely undemocratic – for to accept the authority of anyone but God would be a blasphemy – Takfir wal Hijra is a sort of Islamic fascism. "America and the New Terrorism: An Exchange," Survival Vol 42, no.2 (Summer 2000), 166. The Takfir are the hard core of the hard core: they are the ones who will be called upon to organize and execute the really big attacks.

"The goal of *Takfir* is to blend into corrupt societies in order to better plot attacks against them. Members live together, will drink alcohol, eat during Ramadan, become smart dressers and ladies' men to show just how integrated they are. Mohammed Atta was presumably a *Takfir*. French terrorism expert Jacquard describes *Takfiri* indoctrination this way: '*Takfir* is like a sect: once you're in, you never get out. The *Takfir* rely on brainwashing and an extreme regime of discipline to weed out the weak links and ensure loyalty and obedience from those taken as a member.'" Michael Elliott, "Hate Club," Time 12 November 2001; available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/e20011105hate.htm>; Internet; accessed 5 November 2001.

[46] Worth.

[47] Sayyid Qutb began his career as a modernist literary critic who was radicalized by a roughly yearlong stay in the United States, between 1948 and 1950. Ultimately, Mr. Qutb rejected democracy and nationalism as Western ideas incompatible with Islam. Even pan-Arabism was simply an obstacle to the foundation of an Islamic state. Perhaps even more important, Mr. Qutb was the first Sunni Muslim to find a way around the ancient prohibition against overthrowing a Muslim ruler by calling them infidels. He did so by reinterpreting the works of a medieval intellectual named Ibn Taymiyya, who lived in Damascus in the 13th and 14th centuries, when Syria was in danger of domination by the Mongols. Mr. Qutb was executed by the Egyptian authorities in the mid-1960s for inciting resistance to the regime. Ibid.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Campbell and Flournoy, 298-299.

[50] In addition to bin Laden, the following three men are believed to lead al Qaeda, with outposts worldwide. If any of these top leaders remain alive, they are considered committed and experienced enough to attempt a rebuilding of al Qaeda. They are: *Ayman Al-Zawahiri* a physician and founder of the Egyptian Islamic Jihad. He met bin Laden in the late 1980s and may be his closest adviser. *Rifa'l Taha Musa*, now a top aide to bin Laden, he was associated with the Egyptian Islamic Jihad. He signed bin Laden's pre-September 11 "fatwa" calling for attacks on Americans. *Abu Zubayda*, a Saudi-born Palestinian, he is identified as a coordinator for the recruitment of Islamic militants, particularly in Europe, and for their training at al Qaeda camps. A fourth man, military commander Mohammed Atef, was purportedly killed in U.S. attacks in Afghanistan. David S. Cloud and Neil King Jr., "Slaying the Hydra: Eliminating Bin Laden Cuts Off One Al Qaeda Head, But Not All," Wall Street Journal 28 November 2001; available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/e20011128slaying.htm>; Internet; accessed 28 November 2001.

[51] Lesser, 45-46.

[52] Ibid., 47.

[53] This SPIN concept, a precursor of the netwar concept, was proposed by Luther Gerlach and Virginia Hine in the 1960s to depict U.S. social movements. It anticipates many points about network forms of organization that are now coming into focus in the analysis not only of social movements but also some terrorist, criminal, ethno-nationalist, and fundamentalist organizations. Ibid., 52.

[54] Kurt Eichenwald, "Terror Money Hard to Block, Officials Find," New York Times 10 December 2001; available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Dec2001/e20011210money.htm>; Internet; accessed 10 December 2001.

[55] Kevin McCoy and Dennis Cauchon, "The Business Side of Terror," USA Today 16 October 2001; available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011016side.htm>; Internet; accessed 16 October 2001.

[56] Ibid.

[57] James M. Smith and William C. Thomas, eds., The Terrorism Threat and U.S. Government Response: Operational and Organizational Factors (US Air Force Academy, CO: USAF Institute for National Security Studies, March 2001), ix.

[58] "The primary target for the radical fundamentalists can be found among the three million Afghanistan refugees who currently reside in camps in Pakistan. Their attention is particularly aimed at the young men and boys, many of whom have spent their whole lives in refugee camps. The militants built madrasahs (Qur'anic Schools) and mosques in the camps as their contributions to the furthering of a purist Islam. Such madrasahs provide the means to churn out young, partly educated taliban (students of religion) who have never known Afghanistan as a country and whose vision of the future is based on a perverse interpretation of the Qur'an mixed with anti-Western sentiment." Edward Girardet, "Eyewitness Afghanistan," National Geographic 200, no. 6 (December 2001): 136.

[59] Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, 94. "Just as verses of the Bible can be pulled out of context to support a zealot's cause, so is the Qur'an subject to distortion. Because Islam is a faith without an established hierarchy, it is difficult to overrule such interpretations. So while an imam can offer his followers guidance and scholarship, in the end Islam's authority resides in its scripture, freeing individuals to interpret the Qur'an in their own way. The Qur'an itself acknowledges this dilemma in Sura III:7: 'Some...verses are precise in meaning —they are the foundation of the Book – and others ambiguous. Those whose hearts are infected with disbelief follow the ambiguous part, so as to create dissension...no one knows its meaning except God.'" Don Belt, "The World Of Islam," National Geographic 201, no. 1 (January 2002): 83.

[60] Campbell and Flournoy, 308.

[61] McCoy and Cauchon.

[62] Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, 177.

[63] An example of this can be found in the approval of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to unanimously adopt a plan that includes enhanced police cooperation and steps to choke off the international finances of militant groups. Although the plan of action adopted by the OSCE embodied few substantial initiatives beyond those already launched at the United Nations and other organizations, diplomats said the unanimous adoption will create momentum for carrying them out. Alan Sipress, "55 Nations Endorse Measures to Fight Terrorism," Washington Post 5 December 2001; available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Dec2001/e20011205.htm>; Internet; accessed 7 December 2001.

[64] Paul Hofheinz, "U.S. Anchors a Concentric Alliance Targeting International Terrorism," Wall Street Journal 4 October 2001; available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011004anchors.htm>; Internet; accessed 4 October 2001.

[65] Smith and Thomas, eds., 57.

[66] Campbell and Flournoy, 303.

[67] Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld spelled out what "ultimate victory" would mean for the U.S and its allies: "The ultimate victory in this war is when everyone who wants to can do what everyone of us did today, and this is get up, let your children go to school, go out of the house and not in fear, stand here on a sidewalk and not worry about a truck bomb driving into us. What is at stake is the American ideal itself." Toby Harnden, "Rumsfeld Spells Out What US Victory Will Mean," London Daily Telegraph 24 September 2001; available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Sep2001/e20010924rumsfeld.htm>; Internet; accessed 24 September 2001.

[68] 'The Coercive-Diplomacy Paradigm' is designed to achieve specific goals, where the level of violence is limited, or proportional, to the ends being pursued. The Palestinian movement in pursuit of their independence is viewed in this paradigm. 'The New-World Paradigm' aims at achieving the birth of a 'new world.' This paradigm is likely to seek the vast disruption of political, social, and economic order. However, the ultimate aim is not so much the destruction of society as it is the rebirth after a period of chaotic disruption. An example of this paradigm is the Aum Shinrikyo. Lesser, 68-71.

[69] Ibid., 69.

[70] According to bin Laden's fatwa, the crimes and sins perpetrated by the United States were threefold: First, the U.S. had "stormed" the Arabian peninsula during the Gulf War and continued "occupying the lands of Islam in the holiest of places:" second, it continued to "annihilate what is left of this people (of Iraq) and to humiliate their Muslim neighbors;" and third, it continues "to serve the Jews' petty state and divert attention from its occupation of Jerusalem and murder of Muslims there." Cynthia Storer, "Fatwa or Religious Rulings by Militant Islamic Groups Against the United States," DCI Counterterrorist Center, memorandum prepared in coordination with the CIA, Washington D.C., 23 February 1998.

[71] Lemann. Michael Doran, a professor of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University, posits that bin Laden's overall strategy may be that he "is using the U.S. as an instrument in his struggle with other Muslims. He wants the U.S. to strike back disproportionately, because he believes that will outrage Muslims and inspire them to overthrow their governments and build an Islamic state." Worth.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Hoffman, "The Modern Terrorist Mindset: Tactics, Targets and Technologies."

[74] Steve Goldstein, "A Strike of Survival from bin Laden," Philadelphia Inquirer 15 November 2001; available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/s20011115strike.htm>; Internet; accessed 16 November 2001.

[75] George W. Bush, Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People, (Washington D.C.: The White House, 20 September 2001).

[76] Presidential Decision Directive-39 states further: "The United States regards all such terrorism as a potential threat to national security as well as a criminal act and will apply all appropriate means to combat it. In doing so, the U.S. shall pursue vigorously efforts to deter and preempt, apprehend and prosecute, or assist other governments to prosecute, individuals who perpetrate or plan to perpetrate such acts. The U.S. shall work closely with friendly governments in carrying out our counter terrorism policy and will support Allied and friendly governments in combating terrorist threats against them. Furthermore, the United States shall seek to identify groups or states that sponsor or support such terrorists, isolate them and extract a heavy price for their actions." William J. Clinton, Presidential Decision Directive 39 U.S. Policy on Counterterrorism (U) (Washington D.C.: The White House, 21 June 1995).

[77] Campbell and Flournoy, 302.

[78] Ibid., 310.

[79] Ibid., 309.

[80] "Economic sanctions are often criticized as ineffective, but the aptness of criticism depends on the definition of effectiveness. Economic sanctions are unlikely by themselves to change the behavior of a state. This does not mean they are ineffective. They impose costs on the target country and so detract from its ability to support terrorism or carry on other activities. Combined with diplomatic sanctions, sanctions on travel, arms embargoes, and other measures, economic sanctions can create a sense of isolation among and increase pressure on the elites in a target country." Smith and Thomas, 146. However, according to a high-level discussion paper within the American Intelligence community, "In theory, the threat or imposition of embargoes and sanctions would appear to be a powerful leveraging tool in the conduct of foreign relations between countries. In practice, no state sponsor of international terrorism against which the U.S. has enacted an embargo or sanctions has renounced its role of sponsorship or denounced terrorism as tool of its foreign policy. Nor has any state once placed on the state sponsors list ever been removed." Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, 191-192.

[81] Smith and Thomas, 146-147.

[82] Fuller, 17.

[83] This point is no more applicable than in the current debate over the most recent distribution of the bin Laden videotape in which he purportedly admits to complicity in the 11 September 2001 attacks. In the Middle East, many Arabs said that the scratchy video did not provide evidence of bin Laden's guilt and that it might even have been fabricated.

GLOSSARY

Al-Jihad – also known as Egyptian Islamic Jihad, Islamic Jihad, and Jihad Group. Egyptian Islamic extremist group active since the late 1970s. Close partner of bin Laden's al Qaeda organization. Suffered setbacks as a result of numerous arrests of operatives worldwide, most recently in Lebanon and Yemen. Primary goals are to overthrow the Egyptian government and replace it with an Islamic state and attack U.S. and Israeli interests in Egypt and abroad. Patterns of Global Terrorism, 2000. United States Department of State, April 2001.

Al Qaeda – Established by a Palestinian academic called Abdallah Azzam in the late 1980s to provide logistics and religious instruction and bring together Arabs who fought in Afghanistan against the Soviet invasion. The operation became known as al-Qaeda al-Sulbah – the "solid base." Usuma bin Laden provided much of the early funding. This organization helped finance, recruit, transport, and train Sunni Islamic extremists for the Afghan resistance. Current goal is to establish a pan-Islamic Caliphate throughout the world by working with allied Islamic extremist groups to overthrow regimes it deems "non-Islamic" and expelling Westerners and non-Muslims form Muslim countries. Issued statement under banner of "the World Islamic Front for Jihad Against the Jews and Crusaders" in February 1998, saying it was the duty of all Muslims to kill U.S. citizens – civilian or military –and their allies everywhere. May have several hundred to several thousand members. Also serves as a focal point or umbrella organization for a worldwide network that includes many Sunni Islamic extremist groups such as Egyptian Islamic Jihad, some members of al-Gama'at al-Islamiyya, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, and the harakat ul-Mujahidin. Patterns of Global Terrorism, 2000. United States Department of State, April 2001.

Asymmetry – Asymmetric approaches are attempts to circumvent or undermine U.S. strengths while exploiting U.S. weaknesses using methods that differ significantly from the Unted States' expected method of operations. [Asymmetric approaches] generally seek a major psychological impact, such as shock or confusion that affects an opponent's initiative, freedom of action, or will. Asymmetric methods require an appreciation of an opponent's vulnerabilities. Asymmetric approaches often employ innovative, nontraditional tactics, weapons, or technologies, and can be applied at all levels of warfare – strategic, operational, and tactical –and across the spectrum of military operations. 1999 Joint Strategy Review.

Hawala – an informal remittance system that moves millions of dollars around the world with virtually no paper trail.

NETWAR – Refers to an emerging mode of conflict and crime at societal levels, involving measures short of traditional war, in which protagonists use network forms of organization and related doctrines, strategies, and technologies attuned to the information age. The protagonists are likely to consist of dispersed small groups who communicate, coordinate, and conduct their campaigns in an internetted manner, without a precise central command. Ian O. Lessor, Countering the New Terrorism, 47.

Strategic Level of War – That level of war at which a nation, often as a member of a group of nations, determines national or multinational (alliance or coalition) strategic security objectives and guidance and develops and uses national resources to accomplish these objectives. Activities at this level establish national and multinational military objectives; sequence initiatives; define limits and assess risks for the use of military and other instruments of national

power; develop global plans or theater war plans to achieve those objectives; and provide military forces and other capabilities in accordance with strategic plans. _Joint Publication 1-02_.

Strategy – The art and science of developing and employing armed forces and other instruments of national power in a synchronized and integrated fashion to secure national or multinational objectives. The National Command Authority translates policy into national strategic military objectives. _Joint Publication 3-0_.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dr. Bruce Hoffman's book <u>Inside Terrorism</u> is a tremendous study on the most salient and important trends in terrorism. The author does a successful job in explaining what terrorists do in order to shed light on likely future patterns and potentialities. This book is highly recommended for those who desire to explore terrorism at its roots. The extensive bibliography alone is worth the effort in researching this book. Equally useful is Kurt Campbell and Michele Flournoy's recently published book, <u>To Prevail: An American Strategy for the Campaign Against Terrorism</u>. Both are fellows at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and do a superior job of conducting an in-depth analysis of the current situation and then providing a recommended strategic campaign against terrorism. Rand Corporation's <u>Countering the New Terrorism</u>, edited by Ian Lesser and the United States Air Academy's <u>The Terrorism Threat and U.S. Government Response: Operational and Organizational Factors</u>, edited by James Smith and William Thomas provide a study of terrorism from a number of different perspectives and make significant recommendations as to the correct strategy to adopt to counter this threat. Finally, Henry H. Han's <u>Terrorism and Political Violence: Limits and Possibilities of Legal Control</u> is a significant collection of independent works by recognized authorities that focus on terrorism. This study is organized into four inter-related sub-themes: understanding terrorism and political violence, clarifying the existing legal control mechanisms of terrorism, considering the new anti-terrorism measures and, finally, determining what needs to be done to deter and further end terrorism.

As can be expected, there is a constant stream of articles, opinions, and studies on terrorism that can be found on the Internet. Of particular note are the following recommended organizations with websites: Center for Strategic and International Studies, Columbia International Affairs Online, The Terrorism Research Center, Canadian Security Intelligence Service, and the State Department Homepage. Each website not only provides substantial articles and studies on the subject, but each also has a number of links to continue the research.

Adelman, Ken. "Facing the Enemy." <u>Washingtonian</u>. November 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/s20011030facing.htm>. Internet. Accessed 30 October 2001.

Ali, Abdullah Yusuf. <u>The Meaning of the Holy Qur'an</u>, 10th ed.. Beltsville, Maryland: Amana Publications, 2001.

"America and the New Terrorism: An Exchange." <u>Survival</u> 42, no. 2 (Summer 2000): 156-172.

"Background: Osama bin Laden and the Al-Qaeda Organization." <u>Anti-Defamation League</u>. Available from <http://www.adl.org/terrorism_america/bin_1.asp>. Internet. Accessed 24 September 2001.

Baldauf, Scott. "The 'Cave Man' and Al Qaeda." <u>Christian Science Monitor</u>. 31 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/s20011101caveman.htm>. Internet. Accessed 1 November 2001.

Belt, Don. "The World of Islam." <u>National Geographic</u> 201, no.1 (January 2002): 76-85.

Bin Humaid, Sheikh Abdullah Bin Muhammad. "Jihad in the Qur'an and Sunnah." Maktaba Dar-us-Salam. Available from <http://www.islamworld.net/jihad.html>. Internet. Accessed 28 December 2001.

Bin Laden, Usamah. "Usamah Bin Laden, The Destruction of the Base." Interview conducted by Jamal Isma'il in an unspecified location in Afghanistan on 10 June 1999. The Terrorism Research Center. Available from <http://www.terrorism.com/terrorism/BinLadinTranscript.shtml>. Internet. Accessed 27 September 2001.

Bush, George W. Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People. Washington D.C.: The White House, 20 September 2001.

Campbell, Kurt M. and Michele A. Flournoy. To Prevail: An American Strategy for the Campaign Against Terrorism. The Center for Strategic and International Studies. Washington D.C.: The CSIS Press, 2001.

Clausewitz, Carl von. On War. Edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Clinton, William J. Presidential Decision Directive 39 U.S. Policy on Counterterrorism (U). Washington D.C.: The White House, 21 June 1995.

Cloud, David S. and Neil King Jr. "Slaying the Hydra: Eliminating Bin Laden Cuts Off One Al Qaeda Head, But not All." Wall Street Journal. 28 November 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/e20011128slaying.htm>. Internet. Accessed 28 November 2001.

Cunningham, Glenn. "War Room Report 42-01, 26 October 2001." Electronic mail message to James Reilly <James.Reilly@carlisle.army.mil>. 29 October 2001.

Dixit, Aabha. "Soldiers of Islam: Origins, Ideology and Strategy of the Taliban." Available from <http://www.idsa-india.org/an-aug-2.html>. Internet. Accessed 25 September 2001.

Dobbs, Michael. "A Few Trusted Men Lead Bin Laden's Sprawling Network." Washington Post. 27 September 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Sep2001/e20010927few.htm>. Internet. Accessed 27 September 2001.

Eichenwald, Kurt. "Terror Money Hard to Block, Officials Find." New York Times. 10 December 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Dec2001/e20011210money.htm>; Internet. Accessed 10 December 2001.

Elliott, Michael. "Hate Club." Time. 12 November 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/e20011105hate.htm>. Internet. Accessed 5 November 2001.

Feaver, Peter D. "To Maintain That Support, Show Us What Success Means." The Washington Post. 7 October 2001, sec B, p. 1-2.

Fineman, Mark and Stephen Braun. "Life Inside Al Qaeda: A Destructive Devotion." Los Angeles Times. 24 September 2001. Available from

<http://www.latimes.com/news/printedition/front/la-000076508sep24.story>. Internet. Accessed 25 September 2001.

Finn, Peter and Sarah Delaney. "Al Qaeda's Tracks Deepen in Europe." Washington Post. 22 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011022al.htm>. Internet. Accessed 30 October 2001.

Finn, Peter. "Hijackers Depicted as Elite Group." Washington Post 5 November 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/s20011106depicted.htm>. Internet. Accessed 6 November 2001.

France-Presse, Agence. "War Against Terror Bigger Than Afghanistan: Rumsfeld." Times of India. 5 November 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/e20011105bigger.htm>. Internet. Accessed 5 November 2001.

Fuller, Graham E. "Geopolitics: Separating Terrorism from Politics will be Tough." Patriot-News, 23 September 2001, sec B, p. 17.

Giles, Major Phillip Kevin and Captain Thomas Patrick Galvin. Center of Gravity: Determination, Analysis, and Application. Center for Strategic Leadership. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 31 January 1996.

Girardet, Edward. "Eyewitness Afghanistan." National Geographic 200, no 6. (December 2001): 130-137.

Goldstein, Steve. "A Strike of Survival From bin Laden?" Philadelphia Inquirer. 15 November 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/s20011116strike.htm>. Internet. Accessed 16 November 2001.

Gutman, Roy. "Training in Terror." Newsweek. 26 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/s20011030training.htm>. Internet. Accessed 30 October 2001.

Han, Henry H. Terrorism and Political Violence: Limits and Possibilities of Legal Control New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1993.

Harmon, Christopher C. Characteristics of the Militant International Oral testimony to the House Committee on Government Reform, 107th sess. Washington D.C., 20 September 2001.

Harneden, Toby. "Rumsfeld Spells Out What U.S. Victory Will Mean." London Daily Telegraph. 24 September 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Sep2001/e20010924rumsfeld.htm>. Internet. Accessed 24 September 2001.

Hashmi, Sohail. "Where Are They Coming From: The Terrorists' Zealotry is Political Not Religious." The Washington Post, 30 September 2001, sec B, p. 1.

Hoffman, Bruce Dr. "The Modern Terrorist Mindset: Tactics, Targets and Technologies." Columbia International Affairs Online. October 1997. Available from <http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/hob03/>. Internet. Accessed 24 September 2001.

_____. Inside Terrorism. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.

Hofheinz, Paul. "U.S. Anchors a Concentric Alliance Targeting International Terrorism." Wall Street Journal. 4 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011004anchors.htm>. Internet. Accessed 4 October 2001.

Hunter, Dr. Shireen. "New Trends in Islamic Extremism." Center for Strategic and International Studies. September 12, 2001; available from <http://csis.org/features/nyterror_hunter.htm>. Internet. Accessed 15 November 2001.

Kaiser, Robert G. "U.S. Message Lost Overseas." Washington Post 15 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011015message.htm>. Internet. Accessed 15 October 2001.

Latham, Peter S., J.D. and Patricia Horan Latham, J.D. "Terrorists: Criminals or Soldiers?" Armed Forces Journal International (January 2002): 14-15.

Laqueur, Walter. The Age of Terrorism. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1987.

_____. A History of Terrorism. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2001.

Lemann, Nicholas. "What Terrorists Want." New Yorker. 29 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/s20011024whaterrorists.htm>. Internet. Accessed 30 October 2001.

Lesser, Ian O., et al. Countering the New Terrorism. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1999.

Lewis, Bernard. "The Roots of Muslim Rage." The Atlantic Monthly. September 1990. Available from <http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/90sep/rage.htm>. Internet. Accessed 19 September 2001.

MacFarquhar, Neil. "Islamic Jihad, Forged in Egypt, Is Seen as Bin Laden's Backbone." New York Times. 4 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011004islamic.htm>. Internet. Accessed 4 October 2001.

McCoy, Kevin and Dennis Cauchon. "The Business Side of Terror." USA Today. 16 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011016side.htm>. Internet. Accessed 16 October 2001.

Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism. Patterns of Global Terrorism - 2000. U.S. Department of State. April 2001. Available from <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/pgtrpt/2000/index.cfm?docid=2441>. Internet. Accessed 25 September 2001.

Platzer, Douglas. "The Future of Terrorism." The Terrorism Research Center. March 1997. Available from <http://www.terrorism.com/terrorism/March97a.shtml>. Internet. Accessed 27 September 2001.

Pound, Edward T. "The Root of all Evil." U.S. News & World Report 3 December 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/s20011128root.htm>. Internet. Accessed 28 November 2001.

Qutb, Sayyid. "Paving the Way." Nida'ul Islam no. 23. Available from <http://www.islam.org.au/articles/23/qutb.htm>. Internet. Accessed 28 December 2001.

Rashid, Ahmed. "The Taliban: Exporting Extremism." Foreign Affairs 78, no. 6 (November/December 1999): 22-35.

Robbins, Carla Ann, Gerald F. Seib, and Steve Levine. "War Rules Are Likely To Change in U.S. Battle Against Terrorism." Wall Street Journal. 25 September 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Sep2001/s20010925rules.htm>. Internet. Accessed 25 September 2001.

Rumsfeld, Donald H. "A New Kind of War." New York Times. 27 September 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Sep2001/e20010927kind.htm>. Internet. Accessed 27 September 2001.

_____. "My Goal is to Stop Terrorism." Interview by the USA Today Editorial Board. USA Today. 25 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011025mygoal.htm>. Internet. Accessed 30 October 2001.

Sampson, Anthony. "Military Reprisals Play Into Bin Laden's Strategy." International Herald Tribune. 24 September 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Sep2001/e20010924military.htm>. Internet. Accessed 24 September 2001.

Scowcroft, Brent. "Build a Coalition." Washington Post. 16 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011016build.htm>. Internet. Accessed 16 October 2001.

Sipress, Alan. "55 Nations Endorse Measures to Fight Terrorism." Washington Post. 5 December 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Dec2001/e20011205.htm>. Internet. Accessed 7 December 2001.

Smith, James M. and William C. Thomas, eds. The Terrorism Threat and U.S. Government Response: Operational and Organizational Factors. US Air Force Academy, CO.: USAF Institute for National Security Studies, March 2001.

Storer, Cynthia. "Fatwa or Religious Rulings by Militant Islamic Groups Against the United States." Memorandum prepared in coordination with the CIA. DCI Counterterrorist Center, Washington D.C., 23 February 1998.

Strange, Joe Dr. Centers of Gravity & Critical Vulnerabilities: Building on the Clausewitzian Foundation So That We Can All Speak the Same Language. Marine Corps University

Perspectives on Warfighting, Number Four, 2d ed. Quantico, Virginia: Defense Automated Printing Service Center, 1996.

Tenet, George J. Worldwide Threat 2001: National Security in a Changing World. Statement before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 107th sess., Washington D.C.: Central Intelligence Agency, 7 February 2001.

"The Battle Ahead." Economist. 22-28 September 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Sep2001/s20010924battle.htm>. Internet. Accessed 24 September 2001.

U. S. Department of Defense. Joint Strategy Review 1999. Washington D.C.: The Joint Staff, 1999.

U.S. Department of the Navy. Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps. Warfighting. Marine Corps Doctrinal Publication –1. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of the Navy, 20 June 1997.

U.S. Department of State. Patterns of Global Terrorism 1999. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of State, April 2000.

U.S. Department of State. Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of State, April 2001.

Van Natta Jr., Don and Kate Zernike. "Hijacker's Meticulous Strategy of Brains, Muscle and Practice." New York Times. 4 November 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/s20011106hijackers.htm>. Internet. Accessed 6 November 2001.

Weisman, Jonathan, Barbara Slavin, Richard Willing, and Kevin McCoy. "The War on Five Fronts." USA Today. 30 October 2001. Available from <http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct2001/e20011030fronts.htm>. Internet. Accessed 30 October 2001.

Wilkinson, Paul. "Terrorism: Motivations and Causes." Canadian Security Intelligence Service. January 1995. Available from <http://www.csis-scrs.gc.ca/eng/comment/com53_e.html>. Internet. Accessed 27 September 2001.

Worth, Robert. "The Deep Intellectual Roots of Islamic Terror." The New York Times. 13 October 2001. Available from <http://proquest.umi.com>. Internet. Accessed 10 December 2001.